

REMARKS

Claims 29, 32, 33 and 36-38 remain herein. Claims 30, 31, 34 and 35 have been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer. Claims 37 and 38 have been added.

1. Claim 29 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, because applicants' specification allegedly fails to describe corresponding structure of the claimed "reading means," "communicating means," and "unlocking means." The specification was also objected to for allegedly failing to provide basis for the noted claim elements.

With respect to the claimed "reading means," the corresponding structure is the BCA reproduction part 820 of applicants' Fig. 6. The corresponding structure of "communication means" is the communication part 822 of applicants' Fig. 6. The "unlocking means" is the cipher decoder 837 of applicants' Fig. 6. Thus, applicants' specification discloses structure and provides basis for each of the recited elements of claim 29.

In view of the foregoing, withdrawal of the rejection of claim 29 is respectfully requested. Withdrawal of the objection to the specification is likewise requested.

2. Claims 29, 32, 33 and 36 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102 (e) over Schull '070. Schull '070 generally relates to a digital rights management method. Schull '070 col. 8, lines 10-25, describes a system which reads "unique identifiers" of a media such as a CD-ROM disk. However, Schull '070 fails to disclose or suggest "wherein the identification information is recorded in a burst cutting area (BCA) which overlaps a pre-pit region of the medium, and the

identification information is in a form of stripe patterns, each of the stripe patterns extending along a radius of the medium,” as recited in claims 29 and 33.

Schull ‘070 fails to describe the physical form and the location of the identification information which is unique to the medium. That is, Schull fails to describe unique identifiers recorded on a medium in the form of stripe patterns. Schull also fails to describe unique identifiers in the form of stripe patterns that extend along a radius of a medium. Furthermore, Schull fails to describe unique identifiers recorded in a BCA area overlapping a pre-pit region of a medium.

Thus, there is no disclosure or teaching in Schull ‘070 of all elements of applicants’ presently claimed invention. Accordingly, Schull ‘070 is not an adequate basis for rejection of applicants’ claims under § 102. Nor is there any disclosure in Schull ‘070 that would have suggested applicants’ claimed invention to one of ordinary skill in this art. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections of claims 29, 32, 33 and 36 are respectfully requested.

Accordingly, the application is now fully in condition for allowance and a notice to that effect is respectfully requested. The PTO is hereby authorized to charge/credit any fee deficiencies or overpayments to Deposit Account No. 19-4293. If further amendments would place this application in even better condition for issue, the Examiner is invited to call applicant's undersigned attorney at the number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

STEPTOE & JOHNSON LLP



---

Roger W. Parkhurst  
Reg. No. 25,177  
Daniel W. Shim  
Reg. No. 56,995

Date: December 31, 2007

STEPTOE & JOHNSON LLP  
1330 Connecticut Avenue, N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20036-1795  
Tel: (202) 429-3000  
Fax: (202) 429-3902

Attorney Docket No.: 28951.2011 C11

RWP/DWS/cd